

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/512,078	11/05/2004	Fabio Franceschi	023349-00298	3042	
4372 ARENT FOX 1	7590 02/23/200 I I P	EXAMINER			
1050 CONNEC	CTICUT AVENUE, N.	THAKUR, VIREN A			
SUITE 400 WASHINGTO	N DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
gimioro	1, 20 2000		1794		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/23/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent Mail@arentfox.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/512,078	FRANCESCHI, FABIO	
Examiner	Art Unit	
VIREN THAKUR	1794	

	VIREN THAKUR	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must limely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailir	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of		12C(a) and the appropriat	a automolom foo
Extensions of uniter may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(g). The date it have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(g) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complete.	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> </ol>			cause
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further core</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		I E below);	
(c) They arise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally re	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		empliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):     Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled.		timely filed amendmen	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [	☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ w	ill he entered and an e	unlanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		iii be entered and an e	xpiariation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
Image: A strong to the st			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:			
	/Steve Weinstein/		

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant urges that claim 1 requires both a removable sheet of protective material which covers the top of the capsule and a pod comprised IN the first container. This argument has been carefully considered but is not deemed persuasive. Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with claim 1 (or any of the other independent claims). Claim 1 requires that the first container comprises a pod but does not recite that the pod is placed WITHIN the first container. By reciting that the first container comprises a pod, this has been construed to mean that the first container is the pod, which as disclosed by Favre has been defined by items 41 and 42. It is further noted that the independent claims appear to indicate that both the first container and the pod are defined by item 6 in the figures. This appears to indicate that the first container and the pod are one in the same, as opposed to a first container into which has been placed a pod.

Applicant further urges that "claim 1 requires a pod comprised in the first container also when the sheet of protective material is removed from the capsule." This argument has also been carefully considered but is not deemed persuasive. It is nother applicant's urging is not commensurate in scope with the claims. None of the independent claims recite any limitations regarding the state of the first and second container AFTER the sheet of protective material has been removed.